	Case 3:05-cv-00288-TMB Document 11-2	Filed 04/03/2006	Page 1 of 6
1	DOUGLAS R. DAVIS KEESAL, YOUNG & LOGAN 1029 West Third Avenue, Suite 650 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1954 Telephone: (907) 279-9696 Facsimile: (907) 279-4239		
2			
3			
4	Attorneys for Crowley Marine Services, Inc.		
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	DISTRICT OF ALASKA		
9	GARY J. CROCHET,		
10	Plaintiff,		
11			
12	CROWLEY MARINE SERVICES, CINC.,	ase No. 3:05-CV-28	88-RRB
$\begin{vmatrix} 13 \\ 14 \end{vmatrix}$	Defendant. $\stackrel{)}{\rightarrow} \frac{\mathbf{A}}{\mathbf{A}}$	MENDED ANSW MENDED COMP	
15			
16	Defendant Crowley Marine Services, Inc., by and through counse		
17	answers Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint as follows:		
18	1. Answering paragraph 1, Defendant admits that Plaintif		
19	worked as a seaman on board the Barge 450-1 on October 27, 2004. The		
20	remaining allegations of paragraph 1 of Plaintiff's complaint are denied.		
21	2. Answering paragraph 2	, Defendant adm	its the allegations
22	contained therein.		
23	3. Answering paragraph 3, t	he allegations con	tained therein raise
24	issues of law which require no answer.		
25	4. Answering paragraph 4	, Defendant adm	its the allegations
26	contained therein.		

- 2
- 3
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 1920
- 2122
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

- 5. Answering paragraph 5, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.
- 6. Answering paragraph 6, the allegations contained therein raise issues of law which require no answer.
- 7. Answering paragraph 7, the allegations contained therein raise issues of law which require no answer.
- 8. Answering paragraph 8, Defendant admits the Plaintiff was a resident of the State of Alaska on or about October 27, 2004.
- 9. Answering paragraph 9, Defendant admits that it does business in the State of Alaska. The remaining allegations of paragraph 9 are denied.
- 10. Answering paragraph 10, Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- 11. Answering paragraph 11, Defendant denies any and all allegations concerning any claimed injury by Plaintiff. Defendant admits that its vessel is located within the territorial waters of the State of Alaska, and that it conducts business within the State of Alaska. The remaining allegations of paragraph 11 of the complaint raise issues of law which require no answer.

## ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 12. Answering paragraph 12, Defendant incorporates by reference and realleges its answers to paragraphs 1 through 11 above.
- 13. Answering paragraph 13, Defendant admits that the Barge 450-1 is a vessel that is regularly in navigation in Alaska waters.
- 14. Answering paragraph 14, Defendant admits that Plaintiff was employed on board the Barge 450-1 on October 27, 2004 in Alaska waters. The remaining allegations of paragraph 14 are denied.
  - 15. Answering paragraph 15, Defendant denies the allegations

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

24

Unseaworthiness of the Vessel

25

Against Defendants Crowley Marine Services, Inc. and Barge 450-1

26

23. Answering paragraph 23, Defendant incorporates by reference

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

denied, Defendant denies same.

Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint not heretofore specifically admitted or

## AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.
  - 2. This court lacks jurisdiction over the Barge 450-1.
- 3. Any injury or damages complained of by Plaintiff were caused or contributed to by his own fault, intentional actions or negligence.
- 4. Any injury or damages complained of by Plaintiff were caused or contributed to by the actions or negligence of others over whom Defendant had no duty or control.
  - 5. Plaintiff has failed to mitigate his damages, if any.
- 6. Plaintiff's injuries, if any, were the result of a superceding cause for which Defendant is not liable.
- 7. Defendant's actions in terminating Plaintiff were taken in good faith, with honesty of purpose, and not maliciously. Defendant's actions were jobrelated and consistent with business necessity.
- 8. Plaintiff is barred from asserting claims or causes of actions contained in Plaintiff's complaint by virtue of the doctrines of unclean hands and *in pari delicto*.
- 9. Plaintiff's claims for failure to pay voyage continuance wages, and for wrongful discharge as alleged in plaintiff's third cause of action are preempted by §301 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. §185, and are time-barred by the six month statute of limitations under federal law